

Date: Fri, 2 Apr 93 04:30:35 PST
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #83
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Fri, 2 Apr 93 Volume 93 : Issue 83

Today's Topics:

 2 meter phone calls? (4 msgs)
 Another 3rd Party Question
 Beeper (Pagers) on Airlines (2 msgs)
 No-code issue
 The no-code issue

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Thu, 1 Apr 1993 16:13:57 GMT
From: spsgate!mogate!newsgate!NewsWatcher!user@uunet.uu.net
Subject: 2 meter phone calls?
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <C4s7r1.HDF@icon.rose.hp.com>, greg@core.rose.hp.com (Greg Dolkas) wrote:
>
> Gary Coffman (gary@ke4zv.uucp) wrote:
> : 97.113(a) No amateur station shall transmit any communications the
> : purpose of which is to facilitate the business or commercial affairs
> : of *any* party. [emphasis added]
>
> Shouldn't we define what "party" means? Anything you do involves, directly
> or indirectly, *somebody* on the planet.
> Greg KD6KGW

I agree, Gary's interpretation is way too broad. Asking somebody to

pick up a loaf of bread on the way home is not the same as calling up
Pizza Hut or any other commercial entity directly...

* Chris Terwilliger, KI7LD/AE
* Motorola
* 2100 E. Elliot Rd. EL374
* Tempe, AZ 85284

rrgd50@email.sps.mot.com *
"And now, the sequence of events, *
in no particular order." *
- Dan Rather *

Date: 1 Apr 93 20:32:21 GMT
From: ogicse!emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: 2 meter phone calls?
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <C4s7r1.HDF@icon.rose.hp.com> greg@core.rose.hp.com (Greg Dolkas) writes:

>Gary Coffman (gary@ke4zv.uucp) wrote:
>: 97.113(a) No amateur station shall transmit any communications the
>: purpose of which is to facilitate the business or commercial affairs
>: of *any* party. [emphasis added]
>
>Shouldn't we define what "party" means? Anything you do involves, directly
>or indirectly, *somebody* on the planet. I interpret the rule to say that
>there cannot be a business facilitation involving anyone who is in the
>conversation. To take your interpretation to the extreme would prevent any
>discussion of radio equipment (because you might go out and buy one), any
>sort of talk-in (e.g. a swap meet), or calling your wife to say you're
>stuck in traffic and will grab a burger on the way home.

Well, we've pretty much agreed that ordering a pizza over the patch is out. We also acknowledge that saying "The pizza at the Mellow Mushroom is really good" in the course of conversation is OK. I think the difference is how directly the radio transmission affects the purchase. If your wife tells you to pick up a loaf of bread, that's a direct purchase order, and thus a forbidden use of amateur radio. If she says in the course of conversation, "I think Bunny bread tastes best" that's just a comment on perceived bread quality, stopping and buying bread would be your own decision. However, if this is a prearranged code, it would be forbidden as well.

In general, the rules say the content of amateur transmissions shall "be of such an unimportant nature that recourse to the public telecommunications service is not justified" and "No station shall transmit communications as an alternative to other authorized radio services, except as necessary to provide emergency communications." The latter, from Part 97.113, is pretty clear. If a cellular phone could provide the communications, you can't use an amateur radio

phone patch.

Gary

--
Gary Coffman KE4ZV | You make it, | gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems | we break it. | uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way | Guaranteed! | emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244 | |

Date: 1 Apr 93 21:37:52 GMT
From: ogicse!uwm.edu!cs.utexas.edu!zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!news.acns.nwu.edu!
merle.acns.nwu.edu!hpa@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: 2 meter phone calls?
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

[About using autopatches to avoid phone tolls]

The way I have seen it, it have said "Don't use your autopatch for the *sole* purpose of avoiding phone tolls..." . That seems to fit pretty well with the rule don't use the airwaves for transmissions that are better left on the ground; i.e. don't bring up that autopatch just because you think it is too expensive picking up the phone in the next room.

I think it is a good rule not to use the autopatch when landline (or cellular) phones are readily available. If they are not readily available, it is not an issue of wherefrom you make the autopatch (as long as you don't cross national borders; that is a completely different can of worms).

/hpa

--
INTERNET: hpa@nwu.edu FINGER: hpa@eeecs.nwu.edu
BITNET: HPA@NUACC IBM MAIL: 36073 at IBMX400
HAM RADIO: N9ITP, SM4TKN NeXTMAIL: hpa@speedy.acns.nwu.edu
Linux: a free UNIX clone for the 386. Get yours today from tsx-11.mit.edu!

Date: 1 Apr 93 16:52:40 CST
From: timbuk.cray.com!hemlock.cray.com!cherry10!dadams@uunet.uu.net
Subject: 2 meter phone calls?
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article 010493090842@222.5.80.3, rrgd50@email.sps.mot.com (Chris Terwilliger)

writes:

|In article <C4s7r1.HDF@icon.rose.hp.com>, greg@core.rose.hp.com (Greg
|Dolkas) wrote:
|>
|> Gary Coffman (gary@ke4zv.uucp) wrote:
|> : 97.113(a) No amateur station shall transmit any communications the
|> : purpose of which is to facilitate the business or commercial affairs
|> : of *any* party. [emphasis added]
|>
|> Shouldn't we define what "party" means? Anything you do involves, directly
|> or indirectly, *somebody* on the planet.
|> Greg KD6KGW
|
|I agree, Gary's interpretation is way too broad. Asking somebody to
|pick up a loaf of bread on the way home is not the same as calling up
|Pizza Hut or any other commercial entity directly...

Yes, and saying, "Are you going to get some pizza?" (Without suggesting any brand, store, or etc. does not come nearly as close to facilitating business affairs as does the question, "Are you going to get a new radio?" Would you be restricted from asking, "Are you going to buy a Yeasu?"

--David C. Adams Statistician Cray Research Inc. dadams@cray.com

Old Sourdoughs never die. They just ferment away.

Date: Thu, 1 Apr 93 01:05:53 GMT
From: unogate!news.service.uci.edu!usc!zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!darwin.sura.net!
news-feed-1.peachnet.edu!umn.edu!uum1!kksys.com!edgar!brainiac!moron!
biggus.g4jec.tcman.ampr.org!@mvb.saic.com
Subject: Another 3rd Party Question
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1993Mar30.073714.23515@usl.edu>, cfm1471@ucs.usl.edu (Morrison Charles F) writes:
|> My fiance' is traveling to France this summer, and I'm not looking forward
|>
|> What is the process? I speak with British hams all the time, whats to
|> hurt if i send traffic to a friend in England, thats not a ham. Am i
|> not supposed to reveal matters of military intelligence?
|>

Charlie:

The problem is that in G/F-land's (and, indeed, probably most of EU), third-party traffic to NON-amateurs is forbidden FULLSTOP! It has nothing to do with restricting access from US amateurs specifically.

In recent years the restrictions have been eased somewhat, however, this is normally of the form that at special event stations (e.g. GB calls from the UK) non-amateurs are allowed to "speak into the microphone", but only for period not exceeding 90 seconds or something.

Sorry!

--
73 Chris Cox W0/G4JEC
chrisc@biggus.g4jec.tcman.ampr.org chrisc@biggus.moron.vware.mn.org
Eleventh Hour Contest Group - North American Chapter; Minneapolis, MN
Twin Cities Metro Area Network node (biggus.g4jec.tcman.ampr.org)
**** And lest they forget: ****
Packet radio fiends really enjoy playing with their bits...

Date: Wed, 31 Mar 1993 17:58:25 CST
From: seas.smu.edu!utacfd.uta.edu!rwsys!ricksys!news@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Beepers (Pagers) on Airlines
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

greg@core.rose.hp.com (Greg Dolkas) writes:

> goldstein,marvin (mgsail@prefect.cc.bellcore.com) wrote:
> : Quick question: If a Pager (Beeper) is a radio receiver, does
> : it use an oscillator circuit? Are these allowed to be turned on on an
> : airplane?
> :
>
> If someone managed to beep you at 30,000 feet, what would you *do*?
>

Call them from an Airphone? There is such as a thing if you didn't know.

--
Internet(MX): rick@ricksy.lonestar.org
If I bounce (the maps have errors that I have no control over) then use
bo836@cleveland.freenet.edu or ah053@yfn.ysu.edu
BITNET: bo836%cleveland.freenet.edu@cunyvm or ah053%yfn.ysu.edu@ysub

Date: Thu, 1 Apr 93 18:33:46 GMT
From: walter!porthos!prefect!mgsail@uunet.uu.net

Subject: Beepers (Pagers) on Airlines
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Date: 1 Apr 93 21:22:44 GMT
From: rpi!cary104.its.rpi.edu!mellob@tcgould.tn.cornell.edu
Subject: No-code issue
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

The harder you work to achieve something, the more
you will respect your accomplishments.

If you bought your own car, you took much better care of it
then kids whose fathers bought one for them.

The longer and harder you worked on building that
project, the more you will be inclined to fix it rather than
scrap it when it stops working.

Without some moderately difficult task standing between you
and your own Amateur Radio License, you will have less
respect for the Service and your own accomplishment and will
not hold the Service in as high a regard as you do. It, in
effect, will become "devaluated." (is that a word?)

Case in point: Citizens Band. It is shot to hell because of
the general apathy. Getting on the CB is no significant
acheivement. So hardly anyone uses it respectfully.

Keep in mind that these are generalizations, there are always
exceptions. :-)

So I feel fine about the code requirement. I would prefer that
the entry-level technician license be non-renewable. Leading
to the idea that you would have to upgrade eventually.

So in someone else's words, quit wining and do it.

-Brett Mellor -- mellob@rpi.edu
Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute
Troy, New York

Date: Thu, 1 Apr 1993 14:13:22 GMT

From: usc!zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!darwin.sura.net!knuth.mtsu.edu!raider!
the porch!jackatak!jackhill@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: The no-code issue
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

<I010356@MAINE.MAINE.EDU> writes:

> you need to know Morse Code. I plan on taking the code test, but I
> don't want the use of Morse Code to prevent me from being able to ac-
> cess the wonderful world of HAM radio.

This is NOT meant as a flame, but I think you are missing some very
VERY important perspective of Amateur Radio. It seems as though you,
and so many others who are protesting the CW requirement for HF access
get confused and think HF is all there is.

Not so! HF accounts for only about 2-5% of the frequency allocations
Hams can enjoy. The entire HF allocation will fit nicely inside the
two meter band. Where do you get off mis-stating the facts of life
about Amateur Radio? It is simply not true that one must have a coded
ticket to enjoy access to the "wonderful world of HAM radio"...

There are treaty obligations that require Morse Code proficiency. Yes.
For HF access (a very small portion of the amateur allocations)... The
FCC has chosen to set the speed requirements where they have
historically been, 5wpm for entry level, 13wpm for intermediate and
advanced use, and 20wpm for the Amateur Extra Class. Up until the mid
1970s, one had to have been licensed for two years or MORE at
technician or greater in order to qualify for an Extra! Can you
imagine the whining *that* requirement would create if still in effect
today?

The key here is to avoid thinking that you have somehow been deprived
and refused entry into the wonderful world. When your ticket comes,
you will be a Ham, just like the rest of us, flamers, and elmers,
actives, coded, and VHF-Technicians alike... Welcome, "JR".
Congratulations on pursuing your interests, and please don't let the
2% you do not have keep you from enjoying the tremendous bounty of the
98% you *do* have.

BTW, if you want some fun pholx to talk with in Maine when you get on
the air, drop me e-mail and I'll share some good friends with you.

73

-----+

| Jack GF Hill Voice: (615) 459-2636 jackhill@jackatak.raider.net |

| P. O. Box 1685 Modem: (615) 377-5980 Compu\$erve 76427,31 |

| Brentwood, TN 37024 Bicycling and SCUBA Diving

Ham Call: W4PPT |

+-----+

Date: Thu, 1 Apr 93 18:21:24 GMT
From: walter!porthos!prefect!mgsail@uunet.uu.net
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Mar20.154128.17484@ke4zv.uucp>, <1993Mar22.010104.27200@qualcomm.com>, <1993Mar22.140452.26419@ke4zv.uucp>a
Subject : Re: No Radios on Airlines

Date: Thu, 1 Apr 1993 15:08:59 GMT
From: overload.lbl.gov!agate!usenet.ins.cwru.edu!gatech!darwin.sura.net!
zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!pacific.mps.ohio-state.edu!cis.ohio-state.edu!
udecc.engr.udayton.edu!blackbird.dog.ee.lbl.gov
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Mar31.084349.9627@ke4zv.uucp>, <12434@news.duke.edu>, <1993Mar31.230514.13327@ke4zv.uucp>a.
Subject : Re: 2 meter phone calls?

In article <1993Mar31.230514.13327@ke4zv.uucp> gary@ke4zv.UUCP (Gary Coffman) writes:

>In article <12434@news.duke.edu> jbs@ee.egr.duke.edu (Joe B. Simpson) writes:
>>In article <1993Mar31.084349.9627@ke4zv.uucp> gary@ke4zv.UUCP (Gary Coffman) writes:

>>
>>Correct. But if the wife asks you to stop and pick up a loaf of bread,
>>or tells you the boss just called, you've stepped over the line.

>
>>Boss, yes; bread, no (unless the husband or the wife owns or works at the
>>bakery). How can asking someone to pick up groceries be construed as
>>conducting business?

>
>We've danced around this pole before Joe. The rules say:

>
>97.113(a) No amateur station shall transmit any communications the
>purpose of which is to facilitate the business or commercial affairs
>of *any* party. [emphasis added]

>
>It should be clear that ordering bread is no different than ordering
>pizza. It facilitates the business of the grocer. If it weren't for
>the patch, you wouldn't stop and buy the bread. Now the FCC is currently

>thinking about relaxing the no business rules, so this may soon go
>away. (And about time too.)
>

Agreed.

But...if the XYL doesn't mention a particular store, who's to say you're not stopping at a friend's house and borrowing one? Well, you say, the friend must have bought the bread somewhere -- what if he grew the wheat and baked it himself? Sheesh, we might as well outlaw all transmissions since they "facilitate the regular business affairs" of electronic manufacturers.

See how ridiculous this can get?

Hey, if they're going to saddle us with ridiculous rules, why can't we make liberal interpretations? If the party whose business is being facilitated isn't identified, how can anyone prove that ***any*** party's business is being facilitated?

Looking forward to a ***sensible*** 97.113a...

Jeff

--
Jeff Miller, NH6ZW/N8, AFA1HE (ex WD6CQV, AFA8JM, AFA1D0)
AFIT School of Engineering, Wright-Patterson AFB, OH
"This class (Formal Methods in SW Engineering) redefines the term "auger
in" -- nameless AFIT student. Help eliminate FOD in our lifetime.

Date: 1 Apr 1993 19:56:02 GMT
From: topaz.bds.com!topaz.bds.com!ron@uunet.uu.net
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <RJN41B2w165w@jackatak.raider.net>,
<1993Apr1.183346.23964@porthos.cc.bellcore.com>,
<1993Apr1.185650.24425@porthos.cc.bellcore.com>
Subject : Re: Beepers (Pagers) on Airlines

> In regard to my question on beepers, I was not asking as a user but as
> a passenger wanting to get to my destination in one piece.

Your original questing was a sarcastic, why do you need to get beeped on a plane. The answer is clear. There are times you can call from the planes, other times, you know that you need to first make the phone call before going after your luggage and car rentals. With the advances in

pgers, the receipt of the message itself may be sufficient for you to start acting on the issue while in flight.

> The question is, do beepers pose the same hazards on aircraft as
> do other radio receivers.

Yes.

The issue however if what, if any, this hazard is. However, the FAA has a very simple rule. If you have a portable electronic device, the airline must determine whether it is safe to use that on board (other than portable voice recorders, hearing aids, heart pacemakers, and electric shavers, which have blanket acceptance).

The airline has not much incentive to make a positive determination for things that only a few people would carry (such as scanners, ham radios), but a lot of interest in checking out things that the average business passenger to whom they cater typically carry (such as laptop computers and beepers).

Frankly

Date: 1 Apr 93 15:04:27 GMT
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!usenet.ins.cwru.edu!gatech!concert!
duke!news.duke.edu!ee.egr.duke.edu!jbs@network.UCSD.EDU
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Mar31.084349.9627@ke4zv.uucp>, <12434@news.duke.edu>,
<1993Mar31.230514.13327@ke4zv.uucp>ke
Subject : Re: 2 meter phone calls?

In article <1993Mar31.230514.13327@ke4zv.uucp> gary@ke4zv.UUCP (Gary Coffman) writes:

>
>We've danced around this pole before Joe.

I suppose you mean the collective "we." You and I have not.

>The rules say:
>97.113(a) No amateur station shall transmit any communications the
>purpose of which is to facilitate the business or commercial affairs
>of *any* party. [emphasis added]
>
>It should be clear that ordering bread is no different than ordering
>pizza. It facilitates the business of the grocer. If it weren't for
>the patch, you wouldn't stop and buy the bread. Now the FCC is currently
>thinking about relaxing the no business rules, so this may soon go

>away. (And about time too.)

Read the rule carefully. "...any communications *the purpose of which* is to facilitate the business or commercial affairs of any party." [emphasis added]

Obviously the *purpose* of asking hubby to bring home bread is not to facilitate anyone's business, but to feed Timmy and Sally.

-joe

--
You spend the night
Like you were spending a dime

- Lyle Lovett

Date: 1 Apr 93 19:27:59 GMT
From: csus.edu!netcom.com!jfhp@decwrl.dec.com
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <N4HY.93Mar30102143@tang.ccr-p.ida.org>, <jfhC4qEw5.DD4@netcom.com>, <1993Apr1.143555.22479@nrtpa038.bnrt.ca>
Subject : Re: motive ...

kme@node_17aa4.bnrt.ca (Ken Michael Edwards) wrote:

>This whole discussion would be better served in the rec.radio.amateur.policy newsgroup (if you start pointing out where things belong). The original posting had to do more with politics than amateur radio, maybe you should consider >alt.politics.correct ???

No, it had to do with the ARRL. I thought the policy group was for amateur radio policy at the federal/international level, not ARRL policy.

--

Jack Hamilton jfh@netcom.com P. O. Box 281107 SF, CA 94128-1107

Date: Thu, 1 Apr 1993 14:35:55 GMT
From: vela.acs.oakland.edu!cs.uiuc.edu!wupost!udel!gatech!usenet.ufl.edu!
usenet.cis.ufl.edu!caen!uwm.edu!cs.utexas.edu!convex!news.utdallas.edu!corpgate!
brtph560!nrtpa038!@newshub.nosc.mil
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Mar30.055939.18122@bongo.tele.com>, <N4HY.93Mar30102143@tang.ccr-p.ida.org>, <jfhC4qEw5.DD4@netcom.com>s
Subject : Re: motive ...

In article <jfhC4qEw5.DD4@netcom.com>, jfh@netcom.com (Jack Hamilton) writes:
|> n4hy@tang.ccr-p.ida.org (Bob McGwier) wrote:
|>
|> >I could not agree more. I bitterly resent the damage done to Boy Scouts
|> >by the removal of funding from various sources.
|>
|> There's been lots of discussion of this in rec.scouting. That's where it
|> belongs - not here.
|>
|> --
|>
|> -----
|> Jack Hamilton jfh@netcom.com P. O. Box 281107 SF, CA 94128-1107

This whole discussion would be better served in the rec.radio.amateur.policy newsgroup (if you start pointing out where things belong). The original posting had to do more with politcis than amateur radio, maybe you should consider alt.politics.correct ???

--
=====

Ken M. Edwards, Bell Northern Research, Research Triangle Park, NC
(919) 481-8476 email: cnc23a@bnr.ca Ham: N4ZBB

All opinions are my own and do not necessarily reflect the views of
my employer or co-workers, family, friends, congress, or president.

"You'd better call my dad...My mom's pretty busy."
- Chelsea Clinton

Date: 1 Apr 93 19:32:18 GMT
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!spool.mu.edu!darwin.sura.net!opusc!
usceast!sumner@network.UCSD.EDU
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Mar31.084349.9627@ke4zv.uucp>, <12434@news.duke.edu>,
<1993Mar31.230514.13327@ke4zv.uucp>
Subject : Re: 2 meter phone calls?

About the ordering of bread via an autopatch. I think

arguing that asking someone to pick up bread is facilitating business is quite a stretch and unreasonably pedantic.

Certainly not the intent of the rule.

Ordering bread from a particular store, yes. But the generic concept of ordering bread, no. Otherwise, we can interpret just about anything as facilitating business.

David
AC4KB

Date: 1 Apr 93 18:56:50 GMT
From: walter!porthos!prefect!mgsail@uunet.uu.net
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1p07rv\$cv2@lll-winken.llnl.gov>, <RJN41B2w165w@jackatak.raider.net>, <1993Apr1.183346.23964@porthos.cc.bellcore.com>
Subject : Re: Beepers (Pagers) on Airlines

There seems to be some problem in getting my posting out. Sorry for any garbled postings.

In regard to my question on beepers, I was not asking as a user but as a passenger wanting to get to my destination in one piece. I don't want any flames (it seems that people only use this for flaming rather than enlightenment). The question is, do beepers pose the same hazards on aircraft as do other radio receivers. Thanks for any intelligent answers.

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #83
